UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/583,654	11/07/2006	Fabrice Madigou	15675 P616	3704
	7590 04/03/200 KOLOFF TAYLOR &	EXAMINER		
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY			DEODHAR, OMKAR A	
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		3714		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/03/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/583,654	MADIGOU, FABRICE		
Examiner	A =4 1 == 14		
	Art Unit		

	OMKAR A. DEODHAR	3/14						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 10 March 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(fextensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	36(a) and the appropriat of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	e extension fee ate extension fee e action; or (2) as					
NOTICE OF APPEAL								
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the company of the compa	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
AMENDMENTS								
3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belowed).	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause					
(c) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in beth appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying tl	ne issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1	-	ected claims.						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	,	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		(1)						
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-8. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 		condition for allowan	ce because:					
12.	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
	/Corbett B. Coburn/							
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 3714						

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed claim amendments require the faceplate & display screen to define a concave surface facing the user, whereby the confidentiality of a displayed card hand is ensured. Additionally, the new claims are directed towards the operation of a handle housing the control circuit & the shape of the faceplate/display. These features require further search & consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Tulley does not teach a concave display & faceplate. Examiner respectfully disagrees. As indicated in the Final Office action dated 12/10/2008, the corners of the screen on Figure 12 are concave, at least to some extent. Applicant argues that the prior art combination of Tulley & Norman is improper because a person of ordinary skill would not have combined Tulley's PDA device with Norman's units. Applicant argues that a person of ordinary skill in the art would understand that a PDA is a portable handheld device that includes a display screen. Applicant argues that a person of ordinary skill would not have combined a system of PDAs with a system that requires each player device to have a viewing aperture. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Both prior art references are directed towards portable gaming units with displays & such a combination is indeed proper. The remainder of Applicant's arguments are directed towards the proposed claim amendments & newly proposed claims. Since these claims are not being entered, Applicant's arguments directed towards them are moot.